

# THE MIZAN NEWSLETTER

No. 6 June 1959

---

The Mizan Newsletter aims at giving an objective and balanced account of current Soviet writings on the Middle East.

---

## SOVIET AND CHINESE VIEWS OF THE NON-SOCIALIST EAST

The two biggest Middle East crises of recent years, the Suez crisis and the crisis following the Iraqi revolution, both evoked expressions of Chinese concern and were made the subject of Soviet-Chinese discussions and of joint statements affirming identity of views. The joint Soviet-Chinese declaration issued in Moscow on 18th January 1957, after the visit of a Chinese delegation headed by Chou En-lai, affirmed the support of both countries for Middle Eastern nations struggling to defend their independence against imperialism. The Soviet-Chinese communique issued in Peking on 3rd August 1958, after talks between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, said that recent Middle East events showed that the national liberation movement was "irresistible".

It is now evident that since August 1958 thought has been given to the formulation of a common Soviet and Chinese attitude towards the further development of the "national liberation movement" in eastern and Middle Eastern countries. An interesting joint initiative in this direction was reported in INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.3 of 1959 - a joint conference of the editorial boards of INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS and SHIH-TZE CHIH-SHIH held in January aimed at analysing "the main tendencies of the progressive disintegration of imperialism's colonial system, and also the special features and perspectives of the national liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America". It was stated that the conference "revealed complete agreement on the questions under discussion". But, whatever exchange of views may have taken place, it is noticeable that on a number of questions the opinion finally placed on record is that of one side only - in some cases the Soviet, in some cases the Chinese.

Colonialism and the Peace Movement On the basic premise of present-day Soviet thinking on Asia and Africa, "the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism", identical views were in fact expressed. Both Soviet and Chinese contributors affirmed the inevitability of this historical process, and at the same time the implacable resistance of imperialism to it. But, while Academician E.M. Zhukov dwelt mainly on the resistance of imperialism to the loss of its economic domination in the East, Feng Ping-fu emphasized the all-round "aggressive" activity of "the imperialist colonial forces (who) will not quit the arena of history of their own accord". The peoples of Asia and Africa, he said, were "with each passing day becoming more and more convinced that US imperialism is today the most rapacious variety of colonialism, and that it comes to the support of the European colonial powers whenever the suppression and annihilation of the Asian and African peoples are concerned". Ultimately, Feng Ping-fu declared, the oppressed peoples would succeed in smashing imperialism, but it was "a long, arduous struggle". The Chinese people knew this from their own experience: "the Chinese mainland was liberated in 1949, but to this day the Chinese territory of Taiwan is still occupied by US imperialists."

This virtual identification of "colonialism" with "aggression" in fact serves a particular Chinese purpose: to present the world peace movement as a spearhead of the "national liberation movement" in Asia and Africa. Hsun Fu, in a contribution to the INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS discussion entitled "The national liberation movement and the defence of peace", argues that the world peace movement and the national liberation movement must "coincide", since imperialism is "the source both of colonial oppression and war". He denounces the idea that resistance to imperialist oppression and aggression inevitably leads to armed intervention, and that accommodation with it is therefore necessary in the interests of peace. He cites Iraq as an example of a country which, as a result of its national revolution and liberation, is today a stronghold of peace after being a war base of imperialism.

The Chinese ideal of a militant anti-imperialist peace movement mobilizing the Asian and African masses to defend themselves against "insane American acts of aggression" finds little reflection in present-day Soviet writing on the peace movement. In this the emphasis is on peace as a pre-condition for complete liberation from imperialism, rather than vice versa. As V. Korionov puts it in INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.4 of 1959, the struggle for peace is "a struggle for the liberation of all society, for by upholding peace the working class thereby creates favourable conditions for the struggle to abolish the rule of the monopolists". Korionov's article is based on a theme of the XXist CPSU Congress, that the growing industrial superiority of the USSR is bringing nearer the final banishment of war and the achievement of lasting peace, and that during the new seven-year plan period the Soviet people's successes in building communism will win new supporters for

communism throughout the world; "the international peace forces", says Korionov, "have a reliable mainstay in the country building communism".

Thus, while the Chinese view of the peace movement emphasizes its campaign against colonialism and imperialism and its activities in Asia and Africa, Soviet emphasis is on the movement's ideal of banishing war and the possibility of achieving this thanks to the material progress of the Soviet Union.

Class Struggle in the Eastern Countries On the further evolution of "liberation" movements within eastern countries the Chinese contributors to the INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS discussion have little to say. Feng Ping-fu says that for newly independent countries the task of achieving economic independence is long and complex; Yi Li-yu speaks of China's desire to assist them in this, "without seeking unequal conditions and special privileges in return", despite having to mobilize all her forces to build up her own economy. It is left to the Soviet contributors to give their views of the further internal development of the countries of the "non-socialist East".

This development, in the Soviet view, depends on the outcome of two struggles - a mainly economic one, between foreign monopolies and local bourgeois-owned and State capital, leading to economic independence and the building up of national industry; and the class struggle between the ruling bourgeoisie, often nationalist in sentiment but basically exploiting in character, and the working class, the decisive force in the national liberation movement.

The Soviet contributors to the discussion explain how in colonial and dependent countries the imperialists, having once opened the road to industrial activity, are "powerless to halt the steady development of local national capitalist elements". The result of this is that national capital, finding its expansion blocked by foreign monopolies, makes common cause with the progressive elements working for national liberation. Further, since national capital is too weak by itself to resist the powerful foreign monopolies, recourse is had to state capitalism, and long-term national development programmes are drawn up. While differing from the national economic programmes of socialist countries, these programmes are nevertheless a step forward towards economic and political independence from imperialism.

The Soviet view of the "national bourgeoisie" and its role in the national liberation of eastern countries is fully explained - its basic opposition to imperialism, its "not yet exhausted revolutionary potentialities", but at the same time its "class nature" and its fear of socialism, leading to persecution of communist and workers' parties and removal of the working class from active participation in the political

life of a country. Political independence, won through the support of the national bourgeoisie, is presented as the first blow against the "foreign monopolists" and as thereby a step towards socialism, in accordance with what A.A. Guber calls "the role of the national liberation struggle as an integral part of the world socialist movement".

The Role of the Communist Parties A.A. Guber, in his contribution on "Distinctive features of the national liberation movement", speaks of the role of the Communist Parties in this movement. In Asian and African countries, he says, the attitude of the Communist Parties towards the policy of the ruling classes or groups is decided by the criterion "to what extent does this policy help to preserve and consolidate political independence, and to what extent is it aimed at undermining the key positions of the foreign monopolists". He goes on:

"This demands of the Communist Parties very flexible and at the same time highly principled tactics. The examples we see in Indonesia, India and other countries prove to what degree this correct tactic, based on an estimate of the correlation of class forces, on the one hand, helps to avert a threat of the seizure of power by reactionary groups of the ruling circles linked with imperialist monopolies, to crush, as in Indonesia, the broadly conceived separatist uprisings engineered from the outside, and, on the other hand, helps to compel, with the support of the socialist countries, the imperialists to retreat, as was the case in Egypt, the Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq. If the national bourgeoisie is still able to lead the anti-imperialist struggle, it is only by relying on the people. But only the support of the most politically conscious forces of the people who are consistently working for the complete national and social liberation of their countries gives this struggle real scope and ensures its success."

There are cases, says Guber, where the representatives of the national bourgeoisie who are in power do in fact pursue a policy designed to strengthen the political and economic independence of their country, but at the same time make sharp attacks on the Communist Parties; what should the communists' attitude be in such cases? The criterion, he says, is "what is the role of this Government in the struggle against imperialism?" But at the same time the communists must "seek freedom for democratic activity" and "explain that only the support of the broadest masses can guarantee victory in the fight against imperialism and reaction".

On these issues of class struggle and Communist Party activity in the eastern countries the Chinese contributors to the discussion are silent. Yi Li-yu points out that, according to the Five Principles on

which China's relations with other eastern countries are based, "the people of all countries have the right to choose their own form of government and way of life, and other countries should not interfere in this; revolution cannot be exported, and it is not permissible to interfere from without in the expressed will of a country's people." He is concerned to denounce the "slandorous fabrication" that China aims at "communist expansion". From its inception, he says, the Chinese People's Republic has worked for good relations with the nationalist states of Asia and Africa and for friendly trade and cultural exchanges. China "modestly and conscientiously seeks to learn from every Asian and African country".

China's Example to Asia and Africa Recent Soviet writing on the working-class movement in Asia and Africa contains frequent allusion to the example which China offers to the Asian and African masses. Soviet orientalists are told (PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA No.1, p.20 - see MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.5, Appendix, pp.2-3) that "problems connected with the building of socialism in the people's democracies of Asia, and first and foremost in the great Chinese People's Republic, demand the immediate attention of Soviet orientalists". In an article in MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNIYE OTNOSHENIYA No.3 of 1959, V. Tyagunenko says:

"Under present-day conditions it is no longer capitalism but socialism which is the form of economic organization of society fated to tear the peoples from economic backwardness and poverty. Striking examples of this are the former colonial and semi-colonial countries which have embarked on the path of socialist development - the Chinese People's Republic, the Korean People's Republic and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. . . (Their) successes confirm in practice the well-known Marxist-Leninist principle that an advanced social-economic regime established as a result of a liberation struggle is a decisive condition for the attainment of economic independence. . . V.I. Lenin continually insisted that economic hardships are characteristic of capitalism in general, disregarding any political superstructures over it: 'To abolish these hardships without abolishing capitalism is economically impossible (underlining in text) and not a single example of such an abolition can be cited.' . . . N.S. Khrushchev said in his address to the XXIst CPSU Congress: 'It is now proved by the experience of all the socialist countries of Europe and Asia that real progress is only possible on the socialist path.'"

In contrast with this presentation of China as pointing the road to socialism for the Asian and African masses on Marxist-Leninist lines, the Chinese contributors to the INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS discussion present

their country as offering an example not primarily of socialism but of anti-colonialism. Speaking of China's many visitors from Asia and Africa, Yi Li-yu says: "They have been given the opportunity of convincing themselves on the basis of China's example that the peoples of the East that had finally broken with the colonial yoke now have the opportunity to develop their own inexhaustible potentialities."

Soviet Concern for Chinese Opinion The Soviet Government's concern to reach agreement with China on Middle East policy has its counterpart in the ideological field. The exchange of Soviet and Chinese views held under the auspices of INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS shows that on particular subjects each side is prepared to respect the other's point of view, and that in formulating basic ideological propositions the Chinese attitude is taken into account.

#### MIDDLE EAST OIL: SOVIET VIEWS ON OWNERSHIP

(Note: The first of these two articles on Middle East oil, "The Soviet Case against the West", appeared in MIZAN NEWSLETTER NO.5 of May - Ed.)

The Question of Nationalization It is the general contention of Soviet writers that oil belongs by right to the people of the countries where it is found, and that it is they who should control its production and draw the benefits from its sale. In an article on Persian oil in SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.7 of 1958 L. Teplov speaks of the "categorical demand" of the Persian people that "Persia's natural wealth, its oil, must belong to Persia". In an article in SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.10 of 1958 A. Leonidov says that "if the Kuwaitis owned the oil of Kuwait, this region would be the richest in the capitalist world", but "in fact the Kuwaitis are among the poorest peoples in the world". In THE COUNTRIES OF ARABIA AND COLONIALISM (1956) E. Primakov remarks that in Arabia there is not a single "national" oil refinery. The value of ARAMCO's refinery at Ras Tanura, he says, is put at 65m. dollars; "if the countries of Arabia could enjoy the revenues from their own oil, then it would be possible to create here a powerful national oil refining industry with dozens of such refineries as Ras Ranura."

One might expect that Soviet writers would develop this argument into a general advocacy of nationalization of each Middle East country's oil resources; but this has not happened. In fact, where there has been a local movement for oil nationalization, as in Persia, it has been

extolled in Soviet writings as part of the country's "national liberation movement"; but nationalization of the oil industry has not been invariably presented as an essential item on each country's "national liberation" agenda.

Persia Soviet accounts of the Persian oil nationalization events of 1951-4 tend to present them primarily in the context of Anglo-US rivalry for Persian oil; the best example of this is I.I. Beglov's long article "The part played by the American oil monopolies in the development of the Anglo-Persian conflict of 1951-4", in NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA No.3 of 1958. Beglov refers only indirectly to the Persian public's attitude towards nationalization, in the following passage about the Consortium agreement:

"In dictating their conditions to Persia the oil monopolies desired to give an object lesson to all other countries where they had concessions, that nationalization brought nothing but 'unpleasantnesses', and that not one of these countries would be able to sell oil on the world market against the will of the cartel."

The best Soviet account of the Persian people's attitude during the oil nationalization events is provided in V.S. Baskin's book THE OIL MONOPOLIES IN THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST (1957), in a chapter entitled "The Persian people's struggle for the implementation of nationalization". Baskin says that the Persian workers were the force behind the oil nationalization movement, exerting constant pressure on both the AIOC and the Persian Government; the Tudeh Party, although underground, "headed the movement of the masses for nationalization and for the complete eviction of the foreign monopolies, both British and American". In contrast with the Persian workers, Baskin says, the bourgeoisie and small industrialists - the sponsors of the National Front and of the Mosaddeq Government - looked on nationalization and the ousting of foreign monopolies simply as a means to strengthen their own economic and political position in the country; frightened of the people, they were prevented by their own narrow class outlook from uniting with them in any course of effective and consistent action. Baskin criticizes particularly sharply the provision for compensation contained in the oil nationalization law, which he says threatened to saddle Persia with a huge financial burden and to make the country financially dependent on Britain; resolutely opposed to this, he says, were the popular democratic forces - workers, peasants, progressive intelligentsia and part of the petit bourgeoisie - who demanded that the AIOC's undertakings should be confiscated, that no rights it claimed should be recognized, and that the part of the nationalization law which spoke of such rights should be annulled.

Baskin goes on to speak of popular resistance throughout the Anglo-US negotiations with the Zahedi Government, until the final Consortium agreement which he says amounted to "denationalization" and to "flagrant violation of the nationalization law and trampling on the national interests of Persia". The nationalization law had stated that the Persian oil industry must be directed solely by Persians; the Consortium's directors were all foreigners, except two Persians appointed for appearances only. The functions of the National Iranian Oil Company were confined to "non-industrial activity". The Consortium agreement, in short, had placed Persia in a humiliating position of subordination.

National Initiatives without Nationalization Soviet writers have in general applauded initiatives by Middle East Governments to obtain better terms from existing oil concessionaries, to make more favourable agreements with new entrants into the field, and to form national oil undertakings of various kinds. In an article entitled "Oil politics take a new turn", in NEW TIMES No.39 of 1957, Y. Vasilyev says that in the new climate following the Suez conflict and Suez Canal nationalization "there is a growing realization that. . . even relatively small states can break out of foreign monopoly tutelage and develop their resources in accordance with their national needs"; and certain Middle East Governments, although contemplating "no fundamental revision" of their oil policies, nevertheless want to end the "monopoly rights" enjoyed by the big US and British companies. Examples of this, says Vasilyev, were the National Iranian Oil Company's agreement with the Italian AGIP company; a proposal for the establishment of a national Saudi Arabian oil company; and an Arab League plan for an all-Arab pipeline company.

In an account of the NIOC's agreement with AGIP, in SOVREMENNY VOSTOK No.7 of 1958, L. Teplov says that "the Persian Government is defending its positions and striving to use the oil wealth of the country in the national interests", in which it "enjoys the support of the broadest strata of the Persian public and of all true friends of Persia". The Americans, says Teplov, tried to bribe the NIOC to reject the Italian offer; one of the directors of Standard Oil of New Jersey had offered the NIOC management 30m. dollars, but without success. However, Teplov concludes, this "struggle between the oil monopolies of different capitalist countries" is fundamentally damaging to the national interests of Persia and her people, who insist that their oil wealth belongs only to them.

Iraq In THE ARABS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE (1957) A.F.Fedchenko gives the following account of the Iraqi movement for oil nationalization in 1951:

"Under the influence of the movement for the nationalization of oil in Persia in 1951 a mass collection of signatures for a parliamentary petition on the nationalization of the Iraqi oil industry was carried out. At the end of March eighteen deputies - members of the Istiqlal Party and independents - moved in parliament that the oil concessions should be nationalized, and in Baghdad, Kirkuk, Basrah and other towns crowded meetings were held in support of this. The movement for the nationalization of foreign industries forced the owners of the oil companies to grant concessions.

"In April talks began between a Government delegation and a delegation of oil industrialists on the revision of the concession agreements. But the people of Iraq demanded their complete abolition. Revolutionary demonstrations by students of Baghdad University which started in June 1951 were supported by the workers of the capital, the oil workers of Kirkuk and Basrah and the railway workers of Erbil. . . . Fearing for the results of the talks the concessionaries turned to the British for help, and from the beginning of June large contingents of troops began to arrive in Iraq to fortify the garrison. In addition, Nuri as-Sa'id intensified repressive measures against the liberation movement.

"Talks on the revision of the concession agreements were completed on 26th June 1951 with the signing of a new agreement. . . . The points of this agreement bear witness to the considerable concessions which were granted by the company owners under the influence of the movement for the nationalization of foreign concessions. But if it had not been for the presence of British forces in Iraq the company owners would not have been able to conclude such an agreement."

(The small force of British troops which was moved into southern Iraq in the summer of 1951 was sent in connexion with the situation in Abadan and had nothing to do with any events in Iraq - Ed.)

But, whatever support they may have expressed for oil nationalization movements in retrospect, Soviet writers have not shown any uncompromising insistence on oil nationalization as an indispensable political or economic measure. In an article entitled "How to solve the oil problem" in NEW TIMES No.35 of 1958 G. Starko reaffirms that "the Arabs want to be masters of their oil", but explains how their national demands can be reconciled with the economic needs of Western Europe.

"The Arabs. . . want to sell their oil on a commercial basis, through agreements based on complete equality and mutual

advantage. Even the most far-reaching changes in this respect would not disrupt the Western oil supply, for the Middle East is eager to sell more oil, not less. All it wants is an arrangement based on different principles, more in accord with the spirit of the times. . . . There is not a single instance on record of any Middle East statesman or government suggesting the stoppage of oil exports to the West. On the contrary, the emphasis has always been on the need to cater to Western markets. There is this statement from Prime Minister Abd al-Karim Qasim of the Iraqi Republic: 'We believe that the extraction and sale of oil should be fully maintained; we shall do everything in our power to extend both.'

An article on recent developments in Iraq published in UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA of 5th March 1959 is a typical example of Soviet accounts of the Iraqi Government's handling of oil affairs:

"One of the chief natural resources of Iraq is oil. For this reason the Government is obtaining from the foreign oil companies, who exploit this wealth, an increase in oil output and concession payments. Certain successes have already been achieved in this respect. In 1958 the output of oil in Iraq reached its highest level, about 35m. tons, and gave the country the highest profits in all the history of that branch of industry - over 83m. dinars. While formerly the oil companies interfered unhindered in the internal life of Iraq, the present Government has taken their activities under its control. In November of last year it abrogated the concession agreement with the Khaniqin Oil Company and took the oilfields to which the concession applied under its own control. This measure was taken because the company did not fulfil its obligations concerning the construction of oil refineries and pipelines. The Government's oil policy is determined by the necessity of consolidating the independence and sovereignty of the Iraqi Republic and protecting its national interests. The foreign oil companies are obliged fully to carry out their obligations to the Iraqi Republic and not to interfere in its internal affairs."

In his address to the Iraqi economic delegation on 16th March Khrushchev said that, although "what is taking place in the Iraqi Republic is in no way socialism", nevertheless "progressive reforms" were being carried out there. In the Soviet view, therefore, the Iraqi Government's oil policy would presumably be considered as "progressive" but as "not socialist". However, Soviet accounts of it are uniformly commendatory and uncritical.

## SOVIET ANGLE ON THE NEWS

Below are reviewed Soviet newspaper reports on Middle East events published during the period 14th May - 23rd June.

Soviet-UAR relations Soviet newspapers reported that the UAR High Dam committee delegation which visited the Soviet Union from 6th to 20th May had talks about the High Dam with Soviet experts and with I.T. Novikov, the Soviet Minister of Power Station Construction. The delegation visited hydroelectric power stations at Kremenchug, Stalingrad and Kuybyshev. The head of the delegation, the UAR Minister of Public Works Musa Arafah, had a talk with Mikoyan on 19th May. IZVESTIYA reported the Cairo press conference of 2nd June at which Musa Arafah spoke of the cordial and cooperative spirit shown in the Soviet-UAR discussions and denied that any concrete proposals for participating in the High Dam had been received from West European firms. PRAVDA of 9th June reported appreciative UAR press comments on the delegation's visit, and quoted the Cairo ROZA AL-YUSUF as saying: "The Soviet experts in the four weeks preceding the UAR experts' visit to Moscow accomplished as much work as the experts of other countries could only have done in four months."

According to IZVESTIYA of 4th June, a group of Soviet experts headed by Prof. I.V. Komzin, the chief Soviet expert on the construction of the Aswan High Dam, arrived in Cairo on 2nd June for discussions on the project for the organization of work on the first stage of the Aswan High Dam and the project for building the dam with an open channel. PRAVDA of 9th June quoted the Cairo ASH-SHA'B as commending the latter project since it would shorten construction time and also save expense.

Soviet newspapers reported the following manifestations of Soviet-UAR friendship during the period reviewed: the gift of £E 1,000 from the Soviet Red Cross and Red Crescent Society to families of victims of the Nile steamer disaster; the visit to Cairo of Soviet pilgrims on their way to Mecca, led by Shakir Khiyaletdinov, the Mufti of the European part of Russia and Siberia - they met members of the Egyptian public at a gathering in the Cairo premises of the Union of Soviet Friendship Societies on 8th June; and the presentation to the UAR specialist in electrochemistry Ahmad Riyad Turki of the diploma of foreign member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

US-UAR relations IZVESTIYA of 21st May and PRAVDA of 18th June published articles denouncing recent expressions of US interest in and friendship for the UAR - in particular the Cairo consultations of the World Bank President Eugene Black, the visit to Syria of the US Ambassador to the UAR Raymond Hare, and the visit to Cairo and other

Middle East capitals of the delegation of the "American Friends of the Middle East". In PRAVDA V. Zhukov said that the doctrine of the "interdependence" of the West and the Middle East which was being advertised by US propagandists was simply a new slogan for the regime under which the Arab peoples had been exploited by the oil monopolies for the last half century. On Eugene Black's talks in Cairo (about Suez Canal development) Zhukov commented:

"Outwardly the 'Black plan' appears as a harmless project of 'aid' for the execution of certain UAR development projects. But in fact it has an ulterior motive...Reuter states bluntly that the aim of the plan is 'to break the economic links of the UAR with the eastern bloc countries'."

As for the release of 25 m. dollars of Egyptian assets frozen in the USA, Zhukov remarked, this was also part of the US "psychological warfare" policy; it might raise false hopes in certain Arab bourgeois circles, "but the fact remains that the USA is quite unwilling to give any real aid to the peoples of the Arab countries". This, said Zhukov, had been amply demonstrated by the original US refusal of assistance for the High Dam, after unsuccessful attempts at blackmail of which the World Bank itself had been the instrument.

Iraq PRAVDA on 18th May reported the formation of an Iraqi-Soviet friendship society in Baghdad, with the Iraqi lawyer Ahmad Ja'far al-Awqati as its president. Branches of the society, it was reported, would shortly be formed in all large towns in the country; they would organize lectures on the life of the Soviet people, exhibitions and showings of Soviet films, and would promote the teaching of Russian.

PRAVDA published under large headlines a report (2nd June) on the departure of the last British soldier from Iraq, and a report (3rd June) on Iraq's denunciation of economic and military aid agreements with the USA.

Speeches and statements by Qasim reported in the Soviet press were those of 14th and 23rd May and 3rd June, and his interview with Anthony Nutting of 28th May. It was noted that Qasim had said that he would not allow parties or party activity at present, and also that, asked by Nutting about his attitude to the communists, he had spoken of them as patriots who did nothing against the country's interests.

Persian-Soviet relations PRAVDA of 4th June published the Soviet Notes of 2nd and 31st May to the Persian Government denying Persian allegations of violation of Persian air space by Soviet aircraft. The Soviet Note of 31st May itself accused Persia of permitting "foreign aircraft

belonging to third powers" to fly over Persian territory near the Soviet frontier, and called this "a hostile and provocative act clearly directed against the security of the USSR and a violation of existing Soviet-Persian agreements".

TRUD of 29th May reported a Soviet Note of protest to Persia against the arrest of two Persian employees of the Soviet Embassy in Tehran, accused of distributing illicit propaganda material. In fact, said the Note, the two persons concerned were taking to official addresses and to newspaper offices copies of the Soviet Embassy bulletin and the magazine SOVIET UNION. The action taken by the Persian authorities, said the Note, was a gross provocation calculated to worsen Soviet-Persian relations.

TRUD of 20th May published a letter from an Azerbaydzhani oil worker of Baku, Feyzulla Abdullayev, expressing his indignation because, he said, the Persian newspaper ETTELA'AT had claimed that Soviet Azerbaydzhan and Georgia should be incorporated in Persia. Such "provocative statements", said Abdullayev, were "made to please the bosses of the aggressive imperialist blocs and have the aim of aggravating relations between the USSR and Persia". Abdullayev went on to denounce ETTELA'AT for further claiming that Soviet Azerbaydzhanis would like to live in Persia; this, he said, was complete nonsense, seeing the vast gulf that there was between living conditions in the two countries.

The situation in Persia Under the headline "Terror in Persia" PRAVDA reported (18th June) the execution in Tehran of Ali Muhammad Alavi, "member of the Central Committee of the People's Party of Iran" (the Tudeh Party). PRAVDA further reported:

"The statement (on the execution) declares that the Persian military prosecutor's office will consider as a communist anyone who 'forms in the country any party or group whose programme consists of opposition to the system of constitutional monarchy'."

(Note: It is difficult to read any such significance into the statement in question, which is published in Summary of World Broadcasts Part IV No.55 - Ed.)

A PRAVDA report (19th June) on the strike of Tehran brickworkers stated that more than 50 workers had been killed by the police, many wounded, and a very large number arrested; "the operation was directed by an American adviser attached to the Persian gendarmerie".

PRAVDA of 15th June reprinted, "with some abridgements", an article from US NEWS AND WORLD REPORT about the situation in Persia, to the effect that in Persia there was increasing popular dissatisfaction

both with the Shah and with American influence in the country.

The situation of the trade unions and the press in Turkey TRUD of 7th June reported the ending of the congress of miners of the Zonguldak coal basin. The first day's session of the congress, said TRUD, had been broken up by the police; they had removed from the hall a leading champion of the miners' rights, Mehmet Alpydyundar, who had been nominated as chairman of the congress, but was opposed by Democratic Party supporters and also by the deputy governor of Zonguldak.

On 2nd June PRAVDA published an article by Mayevskiy entitled "The press under arrest". Two years ago, said Mayevskiy, he was sitting in Istanbul drinking tea with Ahmed Emin Yalman, the editor of VATAN. If he returned to Istanbul today and asked for Yalman, he would be told that Yalman himself was in prison, that his son Tunc Yalman had been in prison for a year, that the Opposition organ ULUS founded by Kemal Ataturk had been shut down a month ago and its editor imprisoned and fined, that even ZAFER the organ of the party in power had been shut down a month ago, etc. It was not that these newspapers were in fact anything but reactionary, Mayevskiy remarked; but the fact was that the present Turkish rulers and their American supporters regarded even the least reflection of the Turkish people's present discontent as calculated to undermine confidence in the Government; one of the victims of the present campaign was a newspaper boy who was calling out "Price of sugar to go up!"

Issued by Central Asian Research Centre  
in association with  
St. Anthony's College (Oxford) Soviet Affairs Study Group.



